

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/827,310	04/06/2001	Harry Chan	1142-2/AMF	4151	
7	590 04/23/2004		EXAMINER		
Dino P. Clarizio			DEL SOLE, JOSEPH S		
Dimock Stratton Clarizio 20 Queen Street West, Suite 3202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Box 102			1722		
Toronto, ON CANADA	M5H 3R3		DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/827,310	CHAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph S. Del Sole	1722				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence addres	s			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ply within the statutory minimum of thirty d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tte. cause the application to become AB	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. "HS from the mailing date of this commulation (ASO). ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13	January 2004.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	is action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow						
Disposition of Claims						
4)	awn from consideration. <u>d 55-58</u> is/are allowed.	application.				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	ge			
Attachment(s)	4\ □ Intensie… S	ummany (PTO 413)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/C Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152 	2)			

Art Unit: 1722

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupke (5.186.878) in view of Chan et al (4,808,098).

Art Unit: 1722

Lupke teaches a vacuum cooling mandrel (Fig 1, #46) for an extrusion die, the vacuum cooling mandrel having a single cooling channel (Fig 1, #25 and col 5, lines 5-25, the channel extends continuously helically from #20, through #25 and back through #21) and multiple vacuum ports (Fig 1, #39), the multiple vacuum ports disposed along an outer surface of the cooling mandrel (Fig 1).

Lupke fails to teach the vacuum ports further having vacuum port holes for independent regulation of vacuum pressure within each vacuum port.

Chan et al teaches vacuum ports (Fig 1, #70) having vacuum holes (Fig 1) for independent regulation of vacuum pressure within each vacuum port for the purpose of easily varying the intensity of vacuum along the sleeve (col 3, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Lupke with independently regulated vacuum holes of the multiple vacuum ports as taught by Chan et al because it enables the easy variation of intensity of vacuum along the sleeve.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 37 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

All other arguments put forth by the Applicant have been agreed to and no objections remain and no rejections remain other than the rejection of claim 37.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-20, 22-29, 31-36, 39-53 and 55-58 allowed.

Art Unit: 1722

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the invention for the reasons set forth in the Office action of 10/14/03.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Joseph S. Del Sole whose telephone number is (571)

I sal Sale

Art Unit: 1722

272-1130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Wanda Walker, can be reached at (571) 272-1151. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for both non-after finals and for after finals.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from the either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free).

J.S.D. April 19, 2004

ROBERT DAVIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300

4/20/04